

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application, with claims 9 – 11 and 15 currently being withdrawn from consideration. Applicants amend claims 8, 12 and 13, cancel claims 9-11 and 15 without prejudice or disclaimer and add new claims 16, and 17. No new matter is introduced.

ALLOWABLE CLAIMS

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that current claims 1 – 7 are allowed.

Applicants further thank the Examiner for indicating that objected claim 13, which is amended to depend from claim 12, would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 12 is allowable for the reasons cited below, and as claim 13 depends from claim 12, that it is also allowable for at least this reason.

Applicants respectfully request therefore that the objection as to claim 13 be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 8 is rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants' regard as their invention. In particular, the recitations relating to the sub-rack unit cited as being ambiguous with respect to indicating whether the sub-rack unit is included as part of the recited structure or not. Applicants amend claim 8 to remove all references to the sub-rack unit, and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,949,646 to Lee et al. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,242,690 to Glover. Claim 14, which depends from claim 12, is rejected under

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,291,766 to Komai. Applicants amend claims 8 and 12 to further clarify the nature of their invention, amend dependent claim 13 to conform to the amendments to independent claims 12 and respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants' amended independent claim 8 discloses a plug-in unit comprising a printed circuit board covered by a metal case having parallel first and second side faces perpendicular to top and bottom faces. First and second spring members 101, 102 elastically deform in response to inward deformation of open ends 81a, 82a of the first and second side faces so as to press outward on the open ends of the side faces with a resilient force (see, e.g., Applicants FIGs. 9A, 9B).

Glover discloses a gasket system for EMI isolation including gaskets 22 for creating an elastic seal between covers 14, 16 and circuit board 12 (see, e.g., FIGs. 2A, 2B of Glover). Unlike Applicants' claimed invention, however, Glover's gaskets do not press outward on the open ends of side faces with a resilient force.

Applicants' amended independent claim 12 discloses a sub-rack unit comprising a back wiring board, first and second guide rail parts, a plurality of plug-in units inserted along the first and second guide rail parts to be plugged into connectors of the back wiring board, a member for forming an air reservoir room under the second guide rail parts, and a plurality of motor-fan units 140 each having a motor fan 144 and a lid member 146 (see, e.g., Applicants' FIG. 19). Each motor-fan unit is detachably plugged into the sub-rack unit under the member forming an air reservoir room such that the lid members are pressed against a bottom face of the member forming an air reservoir room. As a result, each of the motor-fan units and the member forming an air reservoir room are sealably integrated.

Lee discloses computer enclosures having one or more compartments housing electronic equipment and a plurality of fans for cooling the one or more compartments. Several of Lee's

enclosures incorporate a plenum or air reservoir disposed between a set of fans and a compartment. However, unlike Applicants' invention, the plenums are not shown to be sealably integral with the compartments, or to include recesses for plugably and sealably accepting one or more fan units. In particular, Lee fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed motor-fan unit having a motor fan and a lid member.

Accordingly, for the reasons cited above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 8 is not anticipated by Glover, that independent claim 12 is not anticipated by Lee, and that independent claims 8 and 12 are therefore in condition for allowance. As claims 13 and 14 depend from allowable claim 12, Applicants further submit that claims 13 and 14 are allowable for at least this reason.

Applicants further submit that claim 14 is allowable for alternate reasons. Claim 14 adds to claim 12 a filler plug-in to be added to unoccupied positions in the sub-rack unit having the same size and airflow resistance as plug-ins in occupied positions. As a result, airflow within the sub-rack unit as generated by the motor-fan units is uniform, enabling efficient air-cooling of the plug-in units.

Komai teaches a dummy surface plate for EMI shielding in an electronic device housing. The Examiner suggests that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the present invention to produce filler plug-in units for EMI shielding purposes. However, Applicants respectfully submit that, unlike Applicants' claimed invention, Komai fails to teach a filler plug-in unit having an internal configuration generating a matched air flow characteristic for balanced cooling. For example, Komai discloses a surface plate that provides no internal air flow resistance within the electronic device housing. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 is not made obvious by the combination of Lee and Komai, and is therefore in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's objections. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that claims 1 – 8, 12 – 14 and 16 - 17, consisting of independent claims 1, 8 and 12, and the claims dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Passage of this case to allowance is earnestly solicited. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, he is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged on Deposit Account 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas J. Bean
Reg. No. 44,528

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

Katten Muchin Zavis Rosenman
575 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022-2585
(212) 940-8729
Docket No FUJI 18.486 (100794-11695)
TJB:pm